

To: Kavlock, Robert[Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov]
From: Hicklin, Linda
Sent: Fri 7/7/2017 12:52:58 PM
Subject: RE: ORD in Goal 3

You're preaching to the choir here – I was thrilled to have science get its own objective. Just wanted to make sure you knew the thinking I heard from the decision-makers at the table when the framework was being developed (except the red team/blue team, which I got from the news), so you can frame your arguments to address their perspective. They say they want both peer reviewed science and all voices heard, so reaching a common understanding of whose voices (peers vs. anyone with an opinion vs. ?) may become an important question, and it may be revealed by whatever process they have in mind, which may not be your normal peer review process.

From: Kavlock, Robert
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 9:01 PM
To: Hicklin, Linda <Hicklin.Linda@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: ORD in Goal 3

Linda

Don't mind you emailing directly (whether or not you were a former mentor). And thanks for the thinking. We actually are glad to see science be represented explicitly, but the ORD senior staff was near unanimous in thinking Goal 1 was a better fit, especially the way the Goal 3 statement was worded. So I wouldn't word my email as an objection, just we thought what made for better organization. This is especially true for the outside world who probably does not view science as a process (at least not the objective of science). If we already had the answers, we would not have to conduct research. Finding solutions to environmental problems (like with PFAS now and multiple environmental emergencies in the past) is what research is all about. You follow the scientific process to that, but that is like saying the regulatory offices follow the regulatory process to set their standards so they should be under process as well. I did see the idea about red team/blue team. But I have to say, the climate research has already been vetted through multiple major scientific peer reviews across the international landscape, so I really don't see the value. Perhaps if I understood the objectives better than the media coverage I would think definitely.

Bob

On Jul 6, 2017, at 6:56 PM, Hicklin, Linda <Hicklin.Linda@epa.gov> wrote:

Bob,

I hope you don't mind me emailing you directly. It has been long time since you were my mentor. I saw that you sent a comment on the Strategic Plan objecting to ORD/science being placed under Goal 3. You probably already know this, but just in case, I wanted to give you context based on what I know of the thinking when this decision was made. Science was intentionally placed in Goal 3 because it houses the concept of "Process". They said that scientists think they already have the answers. They think scientists should listen to all the voices at the table. (Not sure how this works in concert with peer review.) I assume you saw that the Administrator is recommending the Federal government use a red team/blue team technique to examine climate change. This may be the type of "process" that they are thinking about.

Linda Hicklin

202-564-2688

Office of Planning, Analysis and Accountability

Office of the Chief Financial Officer